

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed August 31, 2010. At the time of the Final Office Action, Claims 4-5, 9-12, 14-17, and 19-28 were pending, and Claims 1-3, 6-8, 13, and 18 were previously cancelled. All pending Claims 4-5, 9-12, 14-17, and 19-28 were rejected in the Final Office Action. Claims 14, 19, 23, and 27 are herein amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims, in view of the amendments set forth above and the following remarks.

Amended Independent Claims 19 and 27 are Allowable.

Independent Claims 19 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mutz* (U.S. 4,644,368) in view of *Fukano* (U.S. 6,633,393).

Applicant submits that amended independent Claims 19 and 27 are allowable over *Mutz* and *Fukano*. For example, amended Claim 19 recites, in part:

at least one sensor for determining the locations of one or more printed markings on the print medium; and

a control unit coupled to the printing unit, the conveying unit and the at least one sensor, wherein the control unit is configured to:

store information regarding a plurality of different print configuration designs, including (a) locations for one or more printed markings corresponding to each different print configuration design and (b) print content corresponding to each different print configuration design;

identify, based on the stored information, a particular one of the print configuration designs corresponding to the locations of the one or more printed markings determined by the at least one sensor;

identify, based on the stored information, the print content corresponding to the identified particular configuration design; and

activate the printing unit to print the identified print content onto the print medium.

Mutz and *Fukano* fail to teach these limitations. The Examiner acknowledges that *Mutz* fails to teach the features regarding the sensor(s) and print configuration designs. (Final

Office Action, page 3). Rather, the Examiner alleges that *Fukano* does teach these features. (Final Office Action, page 4).

However, *Fukano* does not teach the limitations of amended Claim 19 copied above. For example, *Fukano* does not teach a plurality of different print configuration designs, each including **locations for one or more printed markings** corresponding to each different print configuration design. *Fukano* does not teach sensor(s) for **determining the locations of printed marking(s)** on the print medium. *Fukano* does not teach identify a particular configuration design that corresponding to **sensed locations of printed marking(s)**.

Fukano teaches a printer that can detect *which side* of a preprinted print medium, e.g., a check, is exposed to the printing means of the printer, as well as the orientation (direction) of the print medium. This detected data is then used to determine whether to print either predetermined *front side data* or predetermined *rear side data* on each side of the print medium. The printer determines which side of the print medium is facing up by (a) determining whether MICR (magnetic ink character recognition) data can be read from the print medium (6: 57 to 7:6) or (b) determining whether a physical edge of the print medium can be detected (12:30-38).

The first technique of *Fukano* -- determining whether MICR data can be read from the print medium -- does not involve **determining the location** of the MICR data on the print medium, and then determining a configuration design **based on the location** of the MICR data. Rather, *Fukano* simply determines whether or not the MICR reader can successfully read MICR text from the print medium. The second technique of *Fukano* -- determining whether a physical edge of the print medium can be detected -- has nothing to do with detecting **printed markings**, as recite in amended Claim 19.

Thus, *Fukano* does not teach the specific limitations of storing a plurality of different print configuration designs, each including **locations for one or more printed markings** corresponding to each different print configuration design, or using sensor(s) for **determining the locations of printed marking(s)** on the print medium, or identifying a particular configuration design that corresponding to **sensed locations of printed marking(s)**.

Thus, for at least the various reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 19 is clearly distinguished from *Mutz* and *Fukano*. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 19, as well as all claims that depend therefrom. Also, for similar reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of amended independent Claim 27, as well as all claims that depend therefrom.

All Dependent Claims are Allowable.

Dependent Claims 9, 14-15, 17, 21-24, 26, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mutz* (U.S. 4,644,368) in view of *Fukano* (U.S. 6,633,393).

Dependent Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mutz* in view of *Fukano* and *Momose* (U.S. 6,068,187).

Dependent Claims 25 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mutz* in view of *Fukano* and *Lais* (U.S. 6,392,677).

Dependent Claims 4-5 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mutz* in view of *Fukano* and *Momose* '452 (U.S. 2001/0045452).

Applicant submits that all dependent claims are allowable at least because they depend from the independent claims shown above to be allowable. Further, neither *Momose*, nor *Lais* teaches the features of the independent claims not taught by *Mutz* and *Fukano*. Further, Applicant does not concede that any of the proposed combinations of references are legally proper. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the remarks set forth above. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicant respectfully submits a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) Transmittal. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the fee of \$810 required to Deposit Account 50-4871 in order to effectuate this filing.

Applicant believes that there are no other fees due at this time. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4871 of King & Spalding L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicant's attorney at 512-457-2030.

Respectfully submitted,
KING & SPALDING LLP
Attorney for Applicant



Eric M Grabski
Registration No. 51,749

Date: 10 / 13 / 10

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

KING & SPALDING L.L.P.

CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **86528**

512-457-2030

512-457-2100 (fax)